



**Department of Health and Social Services  
Division of Developmental Disabilities Services (DDDS)  
Quality Working Group**

**March 16, 2015 - Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Location:** DDDS Fox Run Site – Large Training Room, Bear, Delaware

**Time:** 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

**Facilitator:** Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz, Controller General's Office

**Minutes:** Vicky Gordy, DDDS

**DDDS Quality Working Group Members Present**

Rebecca Reichardt, OMB	Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz, Controller General's Office
Jane Gallivan, DDDS	Carol Kenton, Parent
Brian Hall, Autism DE	Debra Miller, Chimes
Gail Womble, Parent	Tessie Bonk, Parent
Robert Paxson, DDDS	Verna Hensley, Easter Seals
Terry Olson, The ARC of DE	C. Thomas Cook, Delarf
Frann Anderson, DDDS	

**AGENDA:**

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes
- III. Presentation on the South Carolina Provider Public Data/Ranking System
- IV. Review Draft Report to Legislature

**I. Welcome Introductions**

Meeting opened with Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz thanking everyone for participating and attending; introductions made.

**II. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes**

The Working Group reviewed and approved minutes of February 6, 2015.

**III. Presentation on the South Carolina Provider Public Data/Ranking System**

After the conference call with South Carolina, Robert Paxson, DDDS Regional Director of Quality Improvement took the lead in corresponding with South Carolina. Robert distributed and reviewed information received from South Carolina's review/ranking system with Working Group. The system South Carolina will use (scheduled to be available on-line at end of month) to provide "QA Provider Ratings Directory" information to citizens was shared with Robert. Robert provided snap shots of the

program. Basically, certain standards are rated within the indicators (Administration, Early Intervention, Service Coordination, Day Services, Employment, and Residential), by a 5 star (basic college grading system) standard system. As example, say 10 standards are under an indicator, within the 10 standards, there was 1 citation; therefore, this reflects a 90% score which is revealed as a 4 star score in that category.

This system took two years to develop and had numerous discussions with various stakeholders to come up with the best practices. South Carolina used three years of data to come to first rating reports. An average fiscal year score is available for consumers to see provider performance over a period of time. There are individual category and aggregated scorings available. This system is equipped to provide regional service provider rankings to include site rankings as well. This system has no ties to funding other than well ranked homes may receive more business than lower ranked homes. The program is user friendly.

Discussion surrounded how new or unique models are benchmarked. The Working Group was reminded diversity of current and future models must be considered and requires future discussion.

The handout is meant as a broad overview of a way to approach developing a rating system. Reportedly, South Carolina spent much time discussing the breakdown of categories with stakeholders and QA contractor. It appears that some are weighted more heavily than others. DDDS may use the template from South Carolina and mold accordingly. The appeal of this system is that it is available online and transparent.

The Working Group must identify what category is the most significant and decide how they are ranked then decide on a scoring model. How to fold into a reporting system without breaching confidentiality, presents issues as much of the current inspection process includes assessment of individuals. DDDS is unsure if sufficient resources are available to develop and maintain the system. The biggest concern is how information obtained in the field is propagated into the system. DDDS believes that QA staff can create a form to feed the system as DDDS QA is managing with current resources. This may add additional day services responsibilities to QA staff including frequency of ratings and volume of homes in system that may have a direct staff impact. If technology such as an IPAD was available, QA staff could download information simultaneously during inspections. DSAMHH currently has a scoring system in place, but DDDS requires someone to reformat the system to align with new standards. DDDS has not approached IRM or DTI to date.

How does CARF relate in this type of reporting? This would need to be examined. CARF inspections are scheduled, therefore the administrative category and policy/procedure portion may be considered. Although outcome base data and how collected is reviewed during CARF inspections, CARF does not collect outcome based data to use in accreditation process.

#### **IV. Review Draft Report to Legislature**

The draft report (reviewed and discussed by Working Group) has two major themes, Quality Outcomes and Rates. The Working Group suggested changes and determined that DDDS would make changes and review during a conference call meeting to be scheduled as soon as possible.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.